

Applicants point out that the transmittal letter sent with the application recites 6 sheets of drawings. These six sheets include figures 1-13. Applicant has attached a copy of the postcard received and stamped by the USPTO which also recites 6 sheets of drawings. The 6 sheets of drawings submitted, which were acknowledged as being received by the USPTO, included figures 1-13. Enclosed is a new set of the 6 sheets of drawings which include figures 1-13 and which are supported by the specification. This set of 6 sheets of drawings are the same as originally submitted and should be entered into the application.

The Examiner has imposed a restriction requirement which requires applicants to elect claim 1 and 2, or 3-17, or 18 and 19, or 20. The Examiner alleges that there are four separate inventions and that the first two should be classified in the same class but in different subclasses, and that the second two should be classified in the same class but in different subclasses.

Applicants elect claims 1 and 2 with traverse.


Independent apparatus claim 1 is believed to dominate independent apparatus claim 3 which contains essentially all of the limitations of claim 1 and in addition adds to claim 1 that the semiconductor body houses "a plurality of memory cells arranged in rows and columns in active areas of a semiconductor body with the active areas being separated from one another by a continuous isolation trench in the semiconductor body;". Aside from this limitation and the preamble, claims 1 and 3 are essentially identical. Any search of claim 1 would essentially necessitate a search of claim 3. Since the Examiner alleges that claims 3-17 are

directed to a common invention, then all of these claims should be considered part of the invention of claims 1 and 2. Accordingly, it is requested that the claims that will be searched and effectively elected be claims 1-17.

Independent method claim 18 appears to dominate independent method claim 20 and any search of claim 18 should include a search of classes in which claim 20 is classified. Accordingly claims 18-20 could be found to be a single invention.

It is requested that the attached 6 sheets of drawings be filed in the application as it appears the USPTO has lost or misplaced the 6 sheets originally filed with the application. In addition, it is requested that the restriction requirement be modified such that claims 1-17 be consider a first invention and claims 18-20 be considered a second invention. Since applicants have elected claims 1 and 2, it is requested that the Examiner consider adding claims 3-17 to 1 and 2 in her examination.

Respectfully submitted,
Jack A. Mandelman et al., Applicants

By: 
Irwin Ostroff
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 26013

April 30, 2001

Attached:

Postcard Stamped By USPTO Acknowledging
Receipt of Six (6) Sheets of Drawings
Petition and Fee for Extension of Time
Associate Power of Attorney

Tel. No.: (908) 464-0248
Fax. No.: (908) 464-3431